

Remarks/Arguments:

This is a reply to the office action of November 14.

1. Claim amendments

Claim 1 has been amended by specifying that the installation comprises a second modular application device, applying a different application principle (such as fishtail die, roll coating, spraying, casting etc.) which can be separably mounted as a replacement for the (first) application device. A disclosure for this feature is found on page 2, line 26 to p. 3, l. 8 or in Fig. 1. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2-10 have been amended to conform to the wording of claim 1 (“installation” instead of “apparatus”).

Claims 1 - 10 have been placed in better U.S. form by changing “characterized in that” to “wherein” or “further comprising”, as appropriate, and by other minor editorial changes not affecting the substance of the claims.

In claims 9 and 10, “second” has been replaced by “additional” indicating, that the additional application device is different from the “second application device” claimed in claim 1.

Claim 11 has been canceled.

No new matter has been added to the claims.

2. Novelty of claim 1

The installation claimed in claim 1 is novel over Pankake. Pankake describes a roll pedestal which can be replaced by another roll pedestal for varying the spring response of the system. This allows the user to modify the machine to run different speeds with different rolls.

Claim 1 of the present invention is limited to an application device as a complete structural unit which is separably connected to the installation, and to a second modular application device applying a different application principle and that the second application device can be separably mounted as a replacement of the (first) application device.

Thus a conversion to a different application technique can be carried out by replacing the complete application device (see page 3, line 8 to 11).

The change of the rolls in Pankake is not a change of the structural unit. More importantly, it is not a change of the application principle as claimed in claim 1.

According to the invention, the different modular application devices realize different application principles, such as a slot like applicator, an applicator roll, a spraying apparatus, a casting apparatus etc. (see e.g. page 3/4). The replacement of the modular application devices as complete structural units allows simply adapting the application device to the fluid to be applied. This is a very advantageous feature because one machine can be adapted to different application principles simply by changing the modular application device.

Note that the machine disclosed by Pankake is not adaptable to different application principles. Pankake discloses the variation of coating rolls but does not show a replaceable application unit which allows varying the application principle. The

machine according to Pankake is strictly limited to roll coating and therefore does not present the advantages of the invention.

Because of the distinctions noted above, the installation defined by claim 1 is novel over Pankake. Claims 2 - 10 are deemed allowable as well, for the limitations each inherits from claim 1, and for the additional limitations recited in combination therewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles Fallow/

Charles W. Fallow
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.
10 Post Office Road - Suite 100
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

March 14, 2007